REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for acknowledging that the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-12 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Scognamiglio et al. (USP 6,847,738, hereinafter Scognamiglio) and Gallagher (USPA 2003/0161545). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The combination of Scognamiglio and Gallagher fails to teach or suggest determining a peaking factor by allocating values for the peaking factor to combinations of values of first and second detector signal in the same spatial dimension, and multiplying the first detector signal with the peaking factor to obtain a peaked signal, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-18 depend. Claim 19, upon which claim 20 depends, includes a similar feature.

The Office action asserts that Scognamiglio teaches determining a peaking factor by allocating values for the peaking factor to combinations of values of first and second detector signals in the same spatial dimension, and multiplying the first detector signal with the peaking factor to obtain a peaked signal. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

The Office action fails to identify which elements in Scognamiglio correspond to the claimed first and second detection signals, but asserts that Scognamiglio's output $c_x(n, m, t)$ corresponds to the claimed peaking factor. The claimed peaking factor is specifically claimed to be a function of a first and second detection signal. As illustrated in Scognamiglio's FIG. 4, output $c_x(n, m, t)$ is a function of the output of Scognamiglio's HLHP (Horizontal Linear High Pass filter) device, the current input signal, and the output of Scognamiglio's VLHP (Vertical Linear High Pass filter) device. Because the current input signal cannot be said to correspond to a detection signal, the applicants must assume that the Office action is asserting that the outputs of the HLHP and VLHP devices correspond to the claimed first and second detection signals.

The applicants respectfully note that the claimed first and second detection signals are specifically claimed to be based on the same spatial dimension. As noted above, Scognamiglio's output $c_x(n, m, t)$ is a function of the outputs of Scognamiglio's horizontal and vertical LHP filters. These outputs, by definition are in different spatial dimensions (horizontal and vertical), and thus cannot be said to correspond to the applicants' claimed detection signals in the same spatial dimension.

Because Scognamiglio does not teach determining a peaking factor by allocating values for the peaking factor to combinations of values of first and second detector signal in the same spatial dimension, as specifically claimed in each of the applicants' independent claims, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-12 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Scognamiglio for this teaching is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001